## Case 5:13-cr-00503-BLF Document 14 Filed 01/08/14 Page 1 of 2 BRUCE C. FUNK (SBN 122340) Law Office of Bruce C. Funk 2 46 West Santa Clara Street San Jose, California 95113 Telephone: (408) 280-6488 Facsimile: (408) 286-3139 EÒËZSÒÖÄÄFÐ FIE Email: bcfunkesq@aol.com 4 5 Attorney for Defendant JESUS QUINONES 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 SAN JOSE DIVISION 10 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CASE NUMBER: CR-13-00503-DLJ 12 Plaintiff, STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER 13 CONTINUING STATUS HEARING VS. JESUS QUINONES, 14 15 Defendant. 16 The Defendant, Jesus Quinones, represented by Bruce Funk, and the Government, represented 17 by Casey O'Neill, Assistant United States Attorney, hereby stipulate and request to continue the 18 January 9, 2014 status hearing to February 6, 2014 in order for the Government to provide 19 additional discovery and a proposed plea agreement, additional time is needed in order to 20 adequately represent the Defendant. 21 The parties request that time be excluded through February 6, 2014 for adequate defense 22 preparation. 23 IT IS SO STIPULATED. 24 Dated: January 8, 2014 25 BRUCE C. FUNK Attorney for JESUS QUINONES 26 27 Dated: January 8, 2014 Casey O'Neill 28 Assistant United States Attorney STIPULATION AND (PROPOSED) ORDER CONTINUING STATUS HEARING

CASE NUMBER CR-13-00503-DLJ

## Case 5:13-cr-00503-BLF Document 14 Filed 01/08/14 Page 2 of 2 **ORDER** Based upon the stipulation, representation of counsel, and for good cause shown, the January 9, 2014 status hearing is continued to February 6, 2014 at 10:00 a.m. By agreement and stipulation of the parties, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time from January 9, 2014 through and including February 6, 2014 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161. The Court finds pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and (B)(iv), that the failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Further, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and (B)(iv). Dated: January 1, 2014 United States District Judge